

## REMARKS

**BEST AVAILABLE COPY**Rejections under section 112, par. 2

Herein, Applicant has amended claims 18 and 19. These changes were made to improve the form of the claims. No change to the scope of the claims is intended. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims now and previously also did satisfy 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Though changes have been made herein in an effort to advance prosecution and improve the form of the claims, Applicant respectfully traverses all prior rejections under section 112, par. 2. Those rejections would have been better phrased as objections, since the issues pointed to failed to rise to the level of true indefiniteness under section 112, and instead relate to issues of style and preference. One of ordinary skill in the art would have seen the use of the word "sides" as an obvious slip of the pen and would have understood what was meant.

Rejections under section 112, par. 1

This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Part of the problem here was the use of the word "sides" as corrected above. Applicant respectfully submits that this wording was an obvious slip of the pen and indeed the Examiner could tell perfectly well what was meant, as he sets forth later in the rejection.

The Examiner also appears to be saying that the claims are broader than is justified by the disclosure. Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner misstates the law here. Applicant is allowed to phrase his claims broadly to cover other embodiments, unless the Examiner can find art that would render such claims invalid.

Withdrawal of the rejection is accordingly respectfully requested.

## REMARKS

Art rejections

The art rejections are respectfully traversed.

Since the references are complex, Applicants will confine their remarks to those portions of the references cited by the Examiner, except as otherwise indicated. Applicants make no representation as to the contents of other portions of the references.

The Examiner's other rejections and/or points of argument not addressed would appear to be moot in view of the following. Nevertheless, Applicants reserve the right to respond to those rejections and arguments and to advance additional arguments at a later date. No arguments are waived and none of the Examiner's statements are conceded.

In rejecting the claims, the Examiner groups a large number of claims together without specifying which limitation of which claim is allegedly found where in the reference. Applicant accordingly respectfully submits that, given the complexity of the references, the rejections, particularly of the dependent claims, fail to satisfy 37 CFR 1.104(c)(2).

Claim 1

Claim 1 recites a coating on a first surface. The coating is applied as a liquid and then solidified. The extension body is separated from the substrate after substantial solidification of the liquid.

In rejecting this claim, the Examiner combines Nishida and Konishi. Applicant respectfully submits that this combination is improper. The Nishida reference relates to the field of optical media, as does the invention, while the Konishi relates to semiconductor manufacturing. Applicant respectfully submits that one of ordinary skill in the art would not look to the semiconductor arts to solve problems associated with manufacturing optical disks.

## REMARKS

Moreover, the liquid that is used in Konishi, per col. 9, lines 51-58, is a developing solution. Applicant finds no teaching or suggestion that this solution would become a coating on a first surface of a substrate, unlike what Applicant claims in claim 1. It does not appear, at least from the part of the patent cited by the Examiner, that the parts 32a and 32b are removed after substantial solidification. Instead, it appears that they are used to clean up the mess that would otherwise come from applying the developing solution to a substrate. Applicant accordingly respectfully submits that there is no teaching or suggestion within Konishi that it could be used for the purposes to which Applicant's extension body is put. Applicant further respectfully submits that the only way that Konishi could be applied against the claims is through impermissible hindsight in light of Applicant's disclosure.

Polygonal extension body

The Examiner states on page 3 of the office action that the shape of the outer periphery of the extension body is not critical to the process and would not affect the product produced. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Applicant has explained in the last paragraph of the specification at page 8 that the shape of the extension body does indeed beneficially affect the product produced.

## REMARKS

*Please charge any fees other than the issue fee to deposit account 14-1270. Please credit any overpayments to the same account.*

Applicant respectfully submits that he has addressed each issue raised by the Examiner and that the application is accordingly in condition for allowance. Allowance is therefore respectfully requested.

<u>CERTIFICATE OF MAILING</u>	
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited this date with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to	
Mail Stop _____ Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria VA 22313-1450	
On _____	(date)
By _____	(signature)

Respectfully submitted,

By *Anne E. Barschall*  
Anne E. Barschall, Reg. No. 31,089  
Tel. no. 914-332-1019  
Fax no. 914-332-7719  
Date of printing: March 8, 2005

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning  
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

**BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES**

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- BLACK BORDERS**
- IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- OTHER:** \_\_\_\_\_

**IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.**

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.